

דרך קצרה

Brief summaries of cRc Kashrus Policies

ROV TASHMISHO IN PRACTICE [ממה נפשך – PART 1]

In the previous installments we were introduced to the concept of רוב תשמישו and the opinion of *Shulchan Aruch* that one can choose the method of *kashering* based on that principle. We now turn to the opinion of *Rema* which is that *l'chatchilah* one should be *machmir* for מיעוט תשמישו (secondary uses) when determining which method of *kashering* to use. As part of this discussion, we will see a number of situations when *Rema* agrees that one may rely on רוב תשמישו.

We saw that the lenient opinions regarding *rov tashmisho* and *hetairah balah* are the two alternate resolutions for an apparent contradiction between statements in a *Gemara* and a *Tosefta*. Accordingly, it is reasonable to be *machmir* for the strict opinion on either question individually, but when both apply then (ממה נפשך) one has no choice but to be lenient. Therefore, *Pri Megadim* and *Rebbi Akiva Eiger* say that in cases where *libun* is only required if one is *machmir* for both מיעוט תשמישו and treating *chametz* as *issurah balah*, there is no need for *libun*, and *hag'alah* is perfectly acceptable.

Support for this can be drawn from the fact that although *Rema* provides three examples where one should follow מיעוט תשמישו (plates, spoons, and cups) he does not suggest any where the secondary use

is one that demands *libun*. This indicates that at least as relates to *Pesach* he would never require *libun* based on the secondary use of a utensil.

Some disagree with this ruling, but the logic presented by these *Poskim* is quite compelling, and it appears that the common practice is to rely on it.

This line of reasoning would explain why we *kasher* flatware for *Pesach* with *hag'alah*. Knives and forks are occasionally used right over the fire in a way that would demand *libun*, and we are satisfied with *hag'alah* because doing so would be based on being *machmir* for both *miut tashmisho* and that *chametz* is *issurah balah*, which we are not required to do. But what about when *kashering* flatware from non-kosher use? Why do we not require *libun* since they are occasionally used over the fire?

It appears that justification for this practice can be found *Sha'ar HaTziun*, citing *Beis Meir*, and based on *Rema* in *Yoreh Deah*. They say that although *l'chatchilah* one must be *machmir* and *kasher* based on every single way the utensil was used (מיעוט תשמישו), if that choice means that the utensil cannot be *kashered*, one may rely on the letter of the law and *kasher* based on *rov tashmisho*. Therefore, it would theoretically be



proper to *kasher* flatware with *libun* based on מיעוט תשמישו, but since that would mean that they cannot be *kashered*, and therefore one is not required to consider those occasional uses. Rather, one can rely on the primary use of the utensil, and accordingly they may be *kashered* with *hag'alah*.

In the coming installment we will see how these points impact the way in which oven racks are kashered

CRC POLICIES

79. A utensil's primary use would demand *hag'alah* to *kasher* it, but the secondary use would require *libun gamur*. [Assuming the utensil is *aino ben yomo*,] is one ever required to perform *libun gamur* when *kashering* this utensil for *Pesach*?

No

80. A utensil's secondary use would demand a form of *kashering* which is "impossible" for this utensil. May one rely on טוב תשמישו and *kasher* accordingly?

Yes

מראה מקומות

שולחן ערוך סימן תנ"א סעיף ו'
רבי עקיבא איגר על מגן אברהם תנ"א ס"ק ו'
פרי מגדים סימן תנ"א א"א ס"ק ו'
בית מאיר סימן תנ"א ס"ק י"א
רמ"א יו"ד סימן קכ"א ה'
שער הציון סימן תנ"א ס"ק נ"א